3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 #117-e DocNumber

Electronic meeting, 21th February– 3rd March 2022

Agenda Item: 8.13.3

Source: Ericsson

Title: [AT117e][888][SON/MDT] SON related Open Issues (Ericsson)

Document for: Discussion, Decision

# Introduction

This contribution addresses the following offline discussion:

\* **[AT117e][888][SON/MDT] SON related Open Issues (Ericsson)**

Including proposal 11, 12, 13, 17 and 18.

All the related invited inputs on these proposals should be taken into account.

Intended outcome: Report for the real final round discussion.

Deadline: 23:55 UTC, Feb, 25th

To aid better communication between the respective delegates handling this topic from different companies, it is requested to fill-in the contact information.

**Contact Information**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Discussion

## Two-Step RA

As part of the per meeting 117 discussion [1] the following proposal has been captured concerning logging the payload information as part of the two-step RA procedure information in the RA report.

Proposal 11 For the 2-step RA, the payload reported by the UE in the RA-Report is equivalent to the overall payload without padding available in the UE buffer size at the time of initiating the 2 step RA procedure.

Thus, Rapporteur would like to ask the following question.

* **Question-1**: Is there any concern with the above proposal about the payload to be reported?
  + - If yes, please comment your concerns

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes (there are concerns)**  **No (no concerns)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

To be added later

Concerning the ASN.1 structure and in particular the format of the IE for logging the payload size two options are discussed and captured as part of the proposal 12 in the pre-meeting 117 offline discussion [1]. The proposal is captured in the following.

Proposal 12 RAN2 to agree on one of the following methods of reporting the payload size:

1. A 8-bit bitstring in RA report, where the value of the 8-bit bitstring refers to the index of the BSR table in TS 38.321 (similar to the definition of the messageSize field within SL-TrafficPatternInfo)

b. The payload size is reported as ENUMERATED {noPayload, sizeRange1, sizeRange2, sizeRange3, sizeRange4, sizeRange5, spare1, spare0} wherein each RANGE is known, e.g. hardcoded in the specification. FFS the values for each range.

For Option A, there is no need to define the ranges of the payload size in RRC, since the values in the bitstring mirrors the BSR indexes used in the MAC specification.   
For Option B instead, it is necessary to define the size ranges in RRC specification (see the FFS in the above option B). Hence, the proponents of Option B are invited to indicate which values they would like to specify in RRC for the various size ranges.

* + **Question-2**: Which option (Option A or Option B) do you prefer as a format of the IE for reporting the payload size?
    - Proponents of Option B are invited to indicate which values to specify in RRC for the various size ranges

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option a**  **Option b (please indicate the size ranges)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

To be added later

In addition as part of the pre-meeting 117 offline discussion [1] the proposal 13 has been captured concerning logging the information required for the PUSCH resource optimization for the two-step RA procedure. The proposal 13 is shown in the following.

Proposal 13 RAN2 to discuss the inclusion of one or more of the following PUSCH resource parameters (4/10 do not support, 4/10 support, 2/10 support it tentatively):

a. msgA-MCS (4 bits)

b. nrofPRBs-PerMsgA-PO (5 bits)

c. msgA-PUSCH-TimeDomainAllocation (4 bits)

d. frequencyStartMsgA-PUSCH (9 bits)

e. nrofMsgA-PO-FDM (2 bits)

In order to facilitate the discussion, Rapporteur would like to ask companies to indicate for each parameter above whether that is preferred (P), acceptable (A), or not acceptable (NA) to include in the RA-Report.

* + **Question-3**: Which of the above parameters are needed in the RA-Report for 2-step RA?
    - Please indicate in the table below for each parameter whether its inclusion in the RA-Report is preferred (P), acceptable (A), or not acceptable (NA).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **a (P/A/NA)** | **b (P/A/NA)** | **c (P/A/NA)** | **d (P/A/NA)** | **e (P/A/NA)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

To be added later

### 2.1.1 Others

Since this is the last meeting, Rapporteur would like to ask if there is any other critical outstanding issue associated to 2-step RA.

* + **Question-4:** Is there any other critical outstanding issue for the 2-step RA topic?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## SCG Failure Information

Concerning the MRO for SCG mobility procedures, during RAN2#116-887.5 email discussion, although one company raised a concern about the unnecessary increase of the *MCGFailureInformation* message size, almost all the other companies agreed to include RA information associated to a SCG failure in the *SCGFailureInformation*. Hence proposal 17 was derived from the pre-meeting 117 email discussion [1]. The proposal addresses the inclusion of the RA information in the SCGFailureInformation.

Proposal 17 The RA Information associated to a SCG failure are included in the SCGFailureInformation.

Thus, rapporteur would like to ask the following question.

* + **Question-5**: Do you have concerns related to the above proposal?
    - If yes, please comment your concerns

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes (there are concerns)**  **No (no concerns)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

To be added later

Related to the scenarios in which the RA Information should be included in the *SCGFailureInformation*, the following proposal was made:

Proposal 18 The RA Information associated to a SCG failure are included in the SCGFailureInformation for the following scenarios:

a. when failureType is set to randomAccessProblem

b. when failureType is set to beamFailureRecoveryFailure

c. when failureType is set to synchReconfigFailureSCG.

In order to facilitate the discussion, Rapporteur would like to ask companies to indicate for each scenario above whether that is preferred (P), acceptable (A), or not acceptable (NA) to consider when including the RA-Information within the SCGFailureInformation.

* + **Question-6**: Which of the above scenarios needs to be considered when including the RA-Information in the SCGFailureInformation?
    - Please indicate for each of the above scenarios whether that is preferred (P), acceptable (A), or not acceptable (NA) to consider.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **a (P/A/NA)** | **b (P/A/NA)** | **c (P/A/NA)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

To be added later

In addition, in the pre-meeting 117 offline discussion [1] the following proposal has been captured and invited the companies to provide their input as contribution.

[Company-tdoc] RAN2 to discuss the necessity of inclusion of previousPSCellID, failedPSCellID, timeSCGFailure in the SCGFailureInformation message.

Among the companies addressing this issue in the contributions, some companies [2][3][4][5][7] agree to include the *previousPSCellID*, *failedPSCellID*, *timeSCGFailure* in the *SCGFailureInformation*. Another company [6] only proposes to include the previousPSCellID, failedPSCellID. One company [8] disagrees to include the above information in the *SCGFailureInformation* because the UE context still exists at the time of receiving the *SCGFailureInformation*, hence network can figure out such information from the UE context and the UHI.

Given the above, companies are asked to provide their preference regarding the inclusion of the following parameters in the SCGFailureInformation:

1. previousPSCellID
2. failedPSCellID
3. timeSCGFailure

In order to facilitate the discussion, Rapporteur would like to ask companies to indicate whether the inclusion of the above paremters in the SCGFailureInformation is preferred (P), acceptable (A), or not acceptable (NA).

* + **Question-7:** Which of the above parameters are needed in the SCGFailureInformation message?
    - Please indicate for each of the above parameters whether their inclusion in the SCGFailureInformation is preferred (P), acceptable (A), or not acceptable (NA)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **a (P/A/NA)** | **b (P/A/NA)** | **c (P/A/NA)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

To be added later

It was also discussed about the inclusion of a 1-bit flag to indicate the running of T304 at the time of SCG failure declaration due to *randomAccessProblem*. It has been argued that with the presence of the flag, the network node receiving the *SCGFailureInformation* can identify whether the SCG failure was declared due to too late PSCell change (e.g., if the T304 was not running) or too early PSCell change (e.g., if T304 was running) thus helping RAN3 to resolve their issues with MRO. The following proposal was formulated in the pre-RAN2#117 email discussion:

[Company-tdoc] The UE includes a 1 bit flag in the SCGFailureInformation to indicate that the T304 was running when the UE declared the SCG failure due to random access problem indication in the SCG MAC.

Companies provided their input and three companies disagreed to include the flag - two companies [2][6] argued assuming the Source PSCell and Failed PSCell inclusion in the SCG failure information is supported, additional flag isn’t necessary, and another company [8] argued that the network can implicitly derive that the UE has declared SCG failure due to SCG change related operation i.e., when the UE includes the RA related information (only *perRAInfoList*), then the network can implicitly derive that the UE is generating the *SCGFailureInformation* to indicate a failed SCG change procedure and thus there is no need to add one-bit flag. Two companies [3][7] support inclusion of the flag indicating the T304 was running.

Hence, from submitted contributions, it is not clear whether there is a strong need to include this information in the SCGFailureInformation.

* + **Question-8:** Is it needed to include in the SCGFailureInformation a flag indicating that the T304 was running at the moment of SCG failure?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes (it is needed)**  **No (it is not needed)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

To be added later

### 2.2.1 Others

Since this is the last meeting, Rapporteur would like to ask if there is any other critical outstanding issue related to the *SCGFailureInformation* enhancements.

* + **Question-9:** Is there any other critical outstanding issue related to SCGFailureInformation enhancements?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## SHR

Concerning the open issues of the SHR, the following proposal was provided in the pre-meeting 117 email discussion [1], and companies were invided to provide their view on whether the T312 threshold for triggering SHR should be configured per measurement identity or a common threshold can be used for triggering SHR no matter T312 was running on which measurement identity.

[Company-tdoc] RAN2 to discuss whether the T312 threshold for the SHR generation should be configured per measurement identity or if that can be common for all measurement identities configured to the UE.

Companis provided their input and among them, and from the configuration standpoint, one company [9] wants the T312 threshold to be configured per measurement identity and other companies [12][13][10][4][11] want to use a common T312 threshold for all measurements identities.

Given that from the submitted contributions there is a majority of companies that prefer adopting the same T312 threshold for all measurement identities, Rapporteur would like to ask the following question:

* + **Question-10**: Do you have concerns on configuring a common T312 threshold for all the measurement identities?
    - If yes, please comment your concerns

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes (there are concerns)**  **No (no concerns)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

To be added later

From triggering SHR standpoint, the following proposal was captured in the premeeting 117 email discussion:

[Company-tdoc] Given that the T312 is associated to the measurement identity, RAN2 to discuss whether to clarify in the specification in which cases the SHR is generated, e.g. one of the following:

* 1. The UE shall log the SHR always when a T312 is running for any measurement identity configured to the UE. In this case, the UE shall indicate which frequency related measurements had triggered the timer T312.
  2. The SHR shall be generated only if the T312 associated to the measurement identity associated to the target cell is running

And according to the companies contributions, some companies [12][13][11][9] agree that SHR should be triggered only if the T312 associated to a measurement identity associated to the target cell was above the T312 threshold. Some other companies [10][4] proposed that SHR should be logged when T312 for any measurement identity was above the threshold. Given that from the submitted contributions there is a slight majory of companies that prefer the option b above, Rapporteur would like to ask the following

* + **Question-11**: Do you have concerns on generating the SHR only when the T312 associated to a measurement identity associated to the target cell is above the T312 threshold?
    - If yes, please comment your concerns

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes (there are concerns)**  **No (no concerns)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

To be added later

Concerning the generation of the SHR and RLF report for the same handover, the following proposal was captured in the premeeting 117 email discussion [1].

[Company-tdoc] RAN2 to consider one or more of the following solutions to address the issue of SHR and RLF report are generated for the same HO:

1. Indicator in the RLF-Report (SHR) indicating that the SHR (RLF-Report) has been already sent to the network for this HO
2. Indicator in the RLF-Report (SHR) indicating that there is an SHR (RLF-Report) associated to the same HO
3. C-RNTI to be included in the SHR, RLF-Report
4. Timestamps in the SHR and RLF-Report to link them in time
5. RLF-Report should be merged with the SHR if the SHR has not been sent yet at the moment of RLF-Report generation, or the SHR should be merged in the RLF-Report.
6. If RLF occurs within a certain time window after the generation of the SHR, the SHR should be discarded if not yet transmitted

In order to facilitate the discussion, Rapporteur would like to ask companies to indicate for each of the above solutions whether that is preferred (P), acceptable (A), or not acceptable (NA). From the submitted contributions, some companies also highlighted preference for certain combinations of the above solutions. You are therefore also invited to express which combinations of the above solutions can work.

* + **Question-12**: Which of the above solutions do you prefer for solving the issue of SHR, and RLF-Report generated for the same HO? Please indicate for each solution whether that is preferred (P), acceptable (A), not acceptable (NA). You can also indicate combinations of solutions that can work together.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **a**  **(P/A/NA)** | **b**  **(P/A/NA)** | **c**  **(P/A/NA)** | **d**  **(P/A/NA)** | **e**  **(P/A/NA)** | **f**  **(P/A/NA)** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary:**

To be added later

### Others

Since this is the last meeting, Rapporteur would like to ask if there is any other critical outstanding issue related to the SHR.

* + **Question-13:** Is there any other critical outstanding issue related to the SHR?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion

**To be added later.**
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